

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified priority document. Applicants also thank the Examiner for acknowledging acceptance of the drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pelin et al. (hereinafter "Pelin") (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,014). Pelin, in general, is related to processing received radio signals.

One novel feature of the present invention, as recited in claims 1 and 6 is the use of both first and second combining algorithms for combining multiple received signals into a single signal. The novel use of two (or more) available algorithms provides a more reliable combined signal (over the related art use of one signal) since an algorithm can be selected that is appropriate to the situation. For example, one algorithm can be adopted for use when local interference is a problem, and a second algorithm can be used for overcoming noise. In the related art, as explained on pages 2 and 3 of the present specification, only one algorithm has been used; thus creating the potential for a non-optimized combined signal.

The Examiner cites the device disclosed in Figure 9 of Pelin as disclosing the features of the present invention. Applicants note that Figure 9 discloses a conventional signal processing technique using a decoupled weighted least squares with projections (DWISLP) algorithm in combining the received signals. More particularly, the Examiner alleges that Figure 9 of Pelin

discloses the recited first and a second algorithms (citing DWILSP 910). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

First, Applicants respectfully submit that in the context of the present invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that DWILSP 910 represents only one algorithm (and not two or more). Nonetheless, solely to advance prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended claim 1 (as well as claim 6) to more clearly define that the first and second algorithms are differing algorithms. In addition, Applicants have added new claims 7-9 to recite other embodiments of the present invention.

With respect to the other rejections contained within the Office Action related to the dependent claims, Applicants also traverse these rejections. Claim 2 recites that the quality of the two resulting signals is estimated. The Examiner alleges that this is disclosed or suggested in col. 2, lines 22-40 of Pelin “as the quality of transmitted signals taken into accounts for (*sic*) DWILSP algorithm to evaluate.” However, as described in Pelin, the “quality” that the Examiner refers to is the quality of the received signal (received input) and *not* that of a “resulting signal” - that is, the quality of the signal after processing by the algorithm. As such, claim 2 is allowable for this reason as well.

Claim 3 is allowable based on its dependency on claims 1/2 for the reasons discussed above as well as for its own features. As for claim 3, the Examiner states that Pelin further teaches that “the estimated quality of the two resulting signals is used to weight the combination of the two resulting signals” (citing col. 2, lines 22-40 as the decoupled weighted least squares with projections (DWILSP) algorithm and the iterative least squares with projections (ILSP) algorithm is used for weighting the combination of the resulting signals (citing col. 2, lines 22-40

for a conventional technique and as well as disclosed in Fig. 11, col. 13, line 54 to col. 14, line 33). First, Applicants submit that neither of these sections suggest weighting the combination of the two resulting signals. The Examiner's citation to Figure 11 shows an embodiment using DWILSP 1120 as the combiner (similar to items 820 and 920 of Figures 8 and 9, respectively). As such, the EST blocks of Figure 11 would not be suggestive of a quality after processing by the algorithm since they are logically (as shown) *before* the algorithm and not after. As such, claim 3 is allowable for this reason as well.

As for claim 4, the Examiner alleges that Pelin discloses "wherein one of the two algorithm is a temporal reference algorithm and the other one of the two algorithm is a spatial reference algorithm" (citing col. 11, lines 2-28 as spatial and temporal algorithm being used). Applicants submit that Pelin does not disclose or suggest an embodiment having two differing algorithms together, and thus, the general suggestion of different algorithms being disclosed in Pelin is not enough to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/824,716

Attorney Docket No. Q63690

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Ronald Kimble  
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 30, 2004